REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 17, 18, 23, 24 and 27 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at pg. 10, lns. 1-2 and pg. 12, lns. 4-7. A listing of all claims is at pages 2-6. Favorable consideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein

I.   Rejection of Claims 1, 7, 8, 15-18, 23-25 and 27-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 7, 8, 15-18, 23-25 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,546,425). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Hanson *et al.* does not teach or suggest *each and every element* set forth in the subject claims.

> For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that *"each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added).

Applicants' claimed invention provides for a novel system and/or methodology for requesting remote procedure execution in a remote computer system via a non-persistent connection while concurrently maintaining the ability to perform other functions, tasks or procedures. Independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 17, 18, 23, 24, 27 and 28) recites *a first computer system directs a call to a second computer system ... via a non-persistent connection ... the second computer system performs remote execution of a remote procedure and upon completion of the remote procedure generates an event trigger* and *the first computer system carries out other procedures while waiting for the event trigger and remote procedure result from the second computer system.* Hanson *et al.* does not teach or suggest such features of applicants' claimed invention.

Hanson *et al.* relates to a Mobility Management Server that acts as a proxy for a Mobile End System, and passes the data or a response to an application server process running on a Fixed End System. Additionally, the Fixed End System, not the Mobility Management Server, is

7

generating events and sending the events to the Mobility Management Service acting in its capacity as a proxy to the Mobile End System. (*See e.g.,* col. 19, ln. 61 to col. 20, ln. 23). Thus, the Mobility Management Server is neither performing remote execution of a remote procedure nor generating an event trigger. Additionally, the Mobile End System does not perform other procedures or tasks while waiting for a response, as recited in the subject claims. Instead, the Mobility Management Server, acting in its proxy capacity, maintains the current state of the Mobile End System. (*See e.g.,* col. 8, lns. 52-60).

In view of at least the foregoing, Hanson *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 17, 18, 23, 24, 27 and 28) and corresponding dependent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the subject claims is requested.

II.   Rejection of Claims 2-6, 9-14, 19-22, 26 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-6, 9-14, 19-22, 26, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson *et al.* It is submitted that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Hanson *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations as recited in the subject claims.

> To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j).

The subject claims depend from independent claims 1, 18, 24 and 28; and, as discussed *supra*, Hanson *et al.* does not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in these independent claims. Specifically, Hanson *et al.* does not teach or suggest a first computer system directs a call to a second computer system ... via a non-persistent connection ... the second computer system performs remote execution of a remote procedure and upon completion of the

8

remote procedure generates an event trigger and the first computer system carries out other procedures while waiting for the event trigger and remote procedure result from the second computer system. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the subject claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

Patrica S. Murphy
Reg. No. 55,964

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731

9